

GOTTLIEB & ASSOCIATES
ATTORNEYS

150 E. 18th St., Suite PHR • New York, NY 10003
Tel (212) 228-9795 • Fax (212) 982-6284
NYJG@aol.com

March 13, 2023

VIA ECF

The Honorable Valerie E. Caproni
United States District Judge
United States District Court
Southern District of New York
Thurgood Marshall
United States Courthouse
40 Foley Square
New York, NY 10007

Re: *Bishop v. Yorkbridge Wealth Partners, LLC*,
Case No.: 1:22-cv-10009

Dear Judge Caproni,

The undersigned represents Cedric Bishop (“Plaintiff”) in the above referenced matter against Defendant, Yorkbridge Wealth Partners, LLC, (“Defendant”). We write to respectfully submit the enclosed Notice of Supplemental Authority with Exhibit “A” annexed thereto in connection with the Plaintiff’s MOTION for Leave to File Amended Complaint along with supporting documents that was submitted on February 3, 2023 (Dkts. 9-11). We thank the Court for its time and consideration of Plaintiff’s application.

Respectfully submitted,

GOTTLIEB & ASSOCIATES

/s/Michael A. LaBollita, Esq.

Michael A. LaBollita, Esq.

cc: all counsel of record VIA ECF

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

----- X
CEDRIC BISHOP, ON BEHALF OF HIMSELF
AND ALL OTHER PERSONS SIMILARLY
SITUATED,

Plaintiffs,

v.

YORKBRIDGE WEALTH PARTNERS, LLC,

Defendants.
----- X

No.: 1:22-cv-10009

NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL
AUTHORITY

**NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Plaintiff Cedric Bishop, on behalf of himself and all other persons similarly situated (“Plaintiff”) respectfully submits this Notice of Supplemental Authority to bring to the Court’s attention a decision issued after the submission of its MOTION for Leave to File Amended Complaint along with supporting documents in the above matter filed on February 3, 2023 (Dkts. 9-11): *Loadholt v. ShirtSpace*, 2023 US Dist LEXIS 36924 [SDNY Mar. 6, 2023, No. 22-CV-02870 (ALC)] (Exhibit “A”). The Court in *Loadholt* denied the Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss, holding that the Plaintiff has satisfied the Second Circuit’s [standing] requirements by specifying when he intends to return to the website (i.e., when the alleged accessibility issues are remediated) and for what purpose (i.e., to purchase the T-shirt he originally tried to buy). This is sufficient to evince Plaintiff’s intent to return to the website for the standing analysis.